

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT DIVISION

|                                       |   |                            |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Patrick Jay Wall, #16649,             | ) |                            |
|                                       | ) |                            |
| Plaintiff,                            | ) | C.A. No. 9:08-1570-HMH-GCK |
|                                       | ) |                            |
| vs.                                   | ) |                            |
|                                       | ) | <b>OPINION &amp; ORDER</b> |
| Sumter-Lee Regional Detention Center, | ) |                            |
| (SLRDC) Sumter, South Carolina;       | ) |                            |
| Simon Major, Jr., Director of SLRDC;  | ) |                            |
| SLRDC Officers; and Both of the       | ) |                            |
| Healthcare Providers under Contract   | ) |                            |
| with the SLRDC in 2007, Doctors,      | ) |                            |
| Nurses, etc.,                         | ) |                            |
|                                       | ) |                            |
| Defendants.                           | ) |                            |

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge George C. Kosko, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2006) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.<sup>1</sup> Patrick Jay Wall (“Wall”), was a pre-trial detainee in the Sumter-Lee Regional Detention Center (“SLRDC”) in Sumter, South Carolina, at the time of the events giving rise to this action. In his Report and Recommendation issued April 16, 2008, Magistrate Judge Kosko recommends dismissing the complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

Wall filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a

<sup>1</sup> The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2006).

party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Wall's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.

It is therefore

**ORDERED** that Wall's complaint is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.  
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
April 29, 2008

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.